

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-6 are withdrawn, Claims 7-12 have been amended, Claims 13-16 have been added, leaving Claims 1-16 for consideration upon entry of the present amendment.

Support for the amendment to Claims 7 and 10 can at least be found in the specification at page 7, lines 19-21.

Support for the amendments to Claims 8, 9, 11 and 12 can at least be found in the specification at page 9, lines 11-16 and at pages 10-12.

Support for new Claims 13-16 can at least be found in Figs. 7A and 7B and the corresponding discussion in the specification, e.g., at page 9.

No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Right of Priority

Applicants are submitting herewith a Certified English Translation of the priority document, Japanese Patent Application No. 2002-216663 with a filing date of July 25, 2002. Accordingly, Applicants can antedate U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0189400 to Nishio et al.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph

Claims 8-9 and 11-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicant regards as the invention.

Applicants have amended Claims 8-9 and 11-12 to more clearly define Applicants' claimed invention. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicants regard as the invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 102(e)

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 USC § 102(e), as allegedly being anticipated by Yamada et al. (US Patent No. 6,768,257; hereinafter “Yamada”).

Independent Claim 7 is directed to a method of manufacturing an organic EL panel comprising, *inter alia*, the following element “forming a hole transporting layer over the entire area of both the insulating films and the pixel electrodes”.

Absent in Yamada is any teaching of forming a hole transporting layer over the entire area of both the insulating films and the pixel electrodes. Since Yamada at least fails to teach forming a hole transporting layer over the entire area of both the insulating films and the pixel electrodes, Yamada fails to teach at least one claimed element. Since Yamada fails to teach at least one claimed element, independent Claim 1 is not anticipated and is therefore allowable.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 USC § 102(e), as allegedly being anticipated by Nishio et al. (US Publication No. 2003/0189400; hereinafter “Nishio”).

This rejection is moot. Nishio et al. can now be removed as prior art, since Applicants have submitted a Certified English translation of their priority document.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 103(a)

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a), as allegedly being unpatentable over Yamada or over Nishio in view of Tang (U.S. Patent No. 5,937,272; hereinafter “Tang”).

Claims 8-9 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a), as allegedly being unpatentable over Yamada or Nishio and further in view of Duineveld et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,891,327; hereinafter “Duineveld”).

Applicant respectfully submit that Nishio et al. can now be removed as prior art, since Applicants have submitted a Certified English translation of their priority document. Therefore, any rejections made using Nishio are moot.

With regards to the rejections based on the primary reference Yamada, it is noted that independent Claim 7 and 10 have been amended for clarity to include the element that the method comprises “forming a hole transporting layer over the entire area of both the insulating films and the pixel electrodes”. Absent in Yamada is any teaching or suggestion of “forming a

hole transporting layer over the entire area of both the insulating films and the pixel electrodes". Tang and Duineveld fail to cure the deficiencies of Yamada, i.e., even if combined, the combined references fail to teach at least one claimed element. Since the combined references fail to teach at least one claimed element, independent Claims 7 and 10 are not obvious and are therefore allowable. Moreover, as dependent claims from an allowable independent claim, Claims 8-9 and 11-12 are, by definition, also allowable.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicants' attorney hereby authorizes that such fee(s) be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: 

Joel T. Charlton

Registration No. 52,721

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

55 Griffin Road South

Bloomfield, CT 06002

Telephone (404) 607-9991

Facsimile (404) 607-9981

Customer No. 23413

Date: March 17, 2006